

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 13, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the following amendments and consider the following remarks.

In the Office Action dated February 13, 2003, claims 1-43 were pending. Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quellet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,052) in view of Morris et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389).

In this response, claims 1-19 and 42 have been cancelled without prejudice and new claims 44-77 have been added. Thus claims 20-41 and 43-77 remain pending. Claims 20, 24, 29, 34, 38, and 43 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quellet in view of Morris. Applicant notices that Quellet was issued after the filing date of the present application. Applicant hereby reserves the right to swear behind Quellet in the subsequent prosecution of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant submits that the new claims 20-41 and 43-77 are patentable over the cited references. Specifically, independent claim 20 recites as follows:

20. A computerized apparatus for viewing images comprising:
a dial capable of being dialed through rotations;
a set of files; and
means for connecting the dial to the set of files wherein by manipulating the dial through rotations, the set of files can be sequentially displayed.

(emphasis added)

Applicant submits that independent claim 20 requires a dial capable of being dialed through rotations and sequentially displaying a set of file by manipulating the dial through

rotations. Applicant submits that none of the cited references discloses, individually or in combination, the above limitations.

Quellet relates to an interface having three concentric annular rings including four pairs of arcs within two inners rings which may be used to position an object for imaging and to manipulate and position the image of an object for comparison and analysis. Morris relates to methods and apparatuses for presenting a collection of digital media in a media container.

Examiner contends that interface 21 of Quellet reads on the dial as claimed in the present application. However, interface 21 of Quellet is not a true dial in a sense of the present application. Particularly, interface 21 cannot be dialed through rotations. Rather, interface 21 of Quellet includes segments (e.g., buttons) of the rings and they can only operate in certain predefined directions (see, Fig. 1, col. 6, lines 54 to 64), instead of rotations (e.g., a true dialing). Similarly, Morris only provides a scroll bar to move the respective window up and down.

In addition, independent claim 20 requires sequentially displaying a set of file by manipulating the dial through rotations. The above limitation is absent from the cited references. In contrast, Quellet displays and moves an image within a window through multiple buttons, while Morris displays multiple thumbnail images within a window. Applicant submits that none of the cited references discloses or suggests, individually or in combination, the limitation of sequentially displaying a set of files by manipulating the dial through rotations. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, independent claim 20 is patentable over the cited references.

Similarly, independent claim 44 recites as follows:

44. A method for presenting presentations, the method comprising:
receiving an input via an interface representing a user manipulable dial capable of being dialed through rotations; and
sequentially displaying at least one presentation from a preselected set of presentations in response to the input.

(emphasis added)

Applicant submits that independent claim 44 requires receiving an input via an interface representing a user manipulable dial capable of being dialed through rotations and sequentially displaying at least one presentation from a preselected set of presentations in response to the input. Applicant submits that none of the cited references discloses or suggests, individually or in combination, the above limitations.

Similarly, independent claims 24, 29, 34, 38, 43, 60 and 76-77 include similar limitations claimed in claims 20 and 44. Therefore, for reasons similar to those discussed above, independent claims 24, 29, 34, 38, 43, 60 and 76-77 are patentable over the cited references.

Furthermore, as claimed in claims 49-51 and 65-67, for example, the presentations are sequentially displayed in a direction according to the dialing direction of the dial. These limitations are absent from the cited references individually or in combination.

Further, as claimed in claims 52 and 68, for example, the presentations are sequentially displayed at a speed according to the dialing speed of the dial. This limitation is absent from the cited references individually or in combination.

Further, as claimed in claims 53-56 and 69-72, for example, any one of the presentations can be selected or unselected and displayed when the dialing stops. These limitations are also absent from the cited references individually or in combination.

Therefore, in addition to those applied to their respective independent claims, for the reasons discussed above, the above claims are independently patentable over the cited references.

The dependent claims 21-23, 25-29, 30-33, 35-38, 39-41, 45-59, and 61-75 depend from one of the above independent claims, thus include all of the distinct features of the respective independent claim, and therefore, for at least the reasons similar to those discussed above, are patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully submitted.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 5/13, 2003.



Kevin G. Shao
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300